EXHIBIT C

1	Kevin J. Curtis, WSBA No. 12085			
2	WINSTON & CASHATT, LAWYERS, a			
3	Professional Service Corporation 601 W. Riverside, Ste. 1900			
-	Spokane, WA 99201			
4	Telephone: (509) 838-6131			
5	Charles L. Babcock IV (admitted pro hac vi	ice)		
6	cbabcock@jw.com Texas Bar No. 01479500			
7	William J. Stowe (admitted pro hac vice)			
8	wstowe@jw.com			
9	Texas Bar No. 24075124 JACKSON WALKER L.L.P.			
10	1401 McKinney Street			
11	Suite 1900 Houston, Texas 77010			
12	(713) 752-4360 (telephone)			
1	(713) 308-4116 (facsimile)			
13	Attorneys for Defendants International Data Group, Inc., CXO Media, Inc. and Steve Ragan			
14				
15	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT			
16	EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON			
17				
18	RIVER CITY MEDIA, LLC, a Wyoming	No. 2:17-cv-105-SAB		
19	limited liability company, MARK FERRIS, an individual, MATT FERRIS.	DEFENDANT INTERNATIONAL DATA		
20	an individual, and AMBER PAUL, an	GROUP, INC.'S OBJECTIONS AND		
	individual,	RESPONSES TO PLAINTIFFS' FIRST SET OF INTERROGATORIES AND		
21	Plaintiffs,	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
22	776	DOCUMENTS TO INTERNATIONAL DATA GROUP, INC.		
23	VS.	DATA GROOF, INC.		
24	DEFENDANT IDG'S OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES			
	TO PLAINTIFFS' FIRST SET OF INTERROGATORIES AND REQUESTS FOR	Winston & Bashatt a professional service corporation		
	ADMISSION PAGE I	1900 Bank of America Financial Center 601 West Riversido Spokane, Washington 99201		
		(509) 638-6131		



KROMTECH ALLIANCE
CORPORATION, a German corporation,
CHRIS VICKERY, an individual, CXO
MEDIA, INC., a Massachusetts
corporation, INTERNATIONAL DATA
GROUP, INC., a Massachusetts
corporation, and STEVE RAGAN, an individual, and DOES 1-50,

Defendants.

Defendant International Data Group, Inc. ("Defendant" or "IDG") serves these Objections and Responses to Plaintiffs River City Media, LLC's ("RCM"), Mark Ferris', Matt Ferris', and Amber Paul's (collectively, "Plaintiffs") First Set of Interrogatories and Requests for Production as follows:

A. GENERAL OBJECTIONS

Defendant generally objects to the Requests to the extent that they call for information protected by the attorney-client privilege, work-product doctrine, or any other privilege protected by law. Defendant's production of privileged information or materials, if any, is inadvertent and does not constitute waiver of any privilege. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(b)(5)(B).

Defendant's objections and responses are based on all information readily available to Defendant at this time, and may be amended, supplemented, or corrected to state an objection or response that is currently inapplicable or unknown after reasonable

DEFENDANT IDG'S OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO PLAINTIFFS' FIRST SET OF INTERROGATORIES AND REQUESTS FOR ADMISSION PAGE 2



inquiry. Defendant reserves its right to amend, supplement, or correct its objections and responses if and when appropriate. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(e)(1).

No response to a Request is intended to indicate that Defendant agrees with any explicit or implicit characterization of the facts, events, circumstances, and/or issues in the Requests, or that any such characterization is relevant to this lawsuit or any other action or proceeding.

Defendant objects to the Requests seeking production of confidential or other sensitive information or materials. Should the parties enter into an agreement regarding treatment of confidential documents and information, Defendant will supplement with appropriately-designated documents and information.

These General Objections apply to Defendant's responses to each and every Request whether or not expressly incorporated.

OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO SPECIFIC REQUESTS

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 1: Produce all Documents related to IDG's corporate structure, including all subsidiaries, parent companies, holding companies, and *any* company holding more than a 10% interest in IDG.

RESPONSE: IDG objects to the portion of this Request that asks IDG to produce all documents related to its "corporate structure" as it is vague and overly broad. IDG also objects on the ground that this Request calls for confidential and commercially-sensitive information. Should the parties enter into an agreement regarding treatment of

DEFENDANT IDG'S OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO PLAINTIFFS' FIRST SET OF INTERROGATORIES AND REQUESTS FOR ADMISSION PAGE 3



confidential documents, Defendant will supplement with appropriately-designated documents.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 2: Produce all Documents related to IDG's corporate structure, including all subsidiaries, parent companies, holding companies, and *any* company for which IDG holes more than a 10% interest

RESPONSE: IDG objects to the portion of this Request that asks IDG to produce all documents related to its "corporate structure" as it is vague and overly broad. IDG also objects on the ground that this Request calls for confidential and commercially-sensitive information. Should the parties enter into an agreement regarding treatment of confidential documents, Defendant will supplement with appropriately-designated documents.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 3: Produce all Documents related to IDG's executive leadership team (meaning all managers, C-suite executives, and/or corporate officers), including the name, title, and employment history for each of the following individuals:

- (a) Ted Bloom
- (b) Michael Friedenberg
- (c) Kirk Campbell

RESPONSE: IDG objects to this Request on the ground that it is overly broad. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing, and subject to and without waiving its general objections, IDG will produce responsive, non-privileged documents relating to the name, title, and employment history for Ted Bloom and Kirk Campbell and a chart listing board-elected officers of IDG. Michael Friedenberg has never been an employee of IDG.

DEFENDANT IDG'S OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO PLAINTIFFS' FIRST SET OF INTERROGATORIES AND REQUESTS FOR ADMISSION PAGE 4



REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 4: Produce all Documents related to IDG's relationship with CXO Media, Inc.

RESPONSE: IDG objects to this Request on the ground that it is overly broad and also vague as to "relationship." IDG also objects on the ground that this Request calls for confidential and commercially-sensitive information. Should the parties enter into an agreement regarding treatment of confidential documents, Defendant will supplement with appropriately-designated documents.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 5: Produce all Documents related to IDG's advertising and marketing of IDG's media properties in the state of Washington.

RESPONSE: IDG objects to this request on the ground that it is vague as to what is meant by "IDG's media properties." IDG also objects to this request on the ground that it is overly broad and directed to general jurisdiction even though (1) the Court's Order (ECF No. 60 at 4) specifically states that "Plaintiffs are only relying on specific jurisdiction"; (2) Plaintiffs' counsel expressly disclaimed general jurisdiction at the hearing on IDG's Motion to Dismiss; and (3) Plaintiffs do not allege general jurisdiction in their Complaint. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing, and subject to and without waiving IDG's general objections, IDG states that it is aware of no such documents.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 6: Produce all Documents related to total sales of each of IDG's products or services, including subscriptions or memberships to magazines or news sites, whether print or online, in the United States generally and to Washington residents specifically.

RESPONSE: IDG objects to this request on the ground that it is directed to general jurisdiction even though (1) the Court's Order (ECF No. 60 at 4) specifically states that "Plaintiffs are only relying on specific jurisdiction"; (2) Plaintiffs' counsel

DEFENDANT IDG'S OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO PLAINTIFFS' FIRST SET OF INTERROGATORIES AND REQUESTS FOR ADMISSION PAGE 5

Uinston & Fashatt

A PROFESSIONAL SERVICE CORPORATION
1900 Bank of America Financial Center
601 West Riveracide
Spokane, Washington 99201
(509) 838-5131

expressly disclaimed general jurisdiction at the hearing on IDG's Motion to Dismiss; and (3) Plaintiffs do not allege general jurisdiction in their Complaint. IDG also objects to this Request on the ground that it is overly broad. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing, and subject to and without waiving IDG's general objections, IDG states that it has no documents related to sale of products or services to Washington residents.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 7: Produce all Documents related to IDG's income derived from advertising on its websites to Washington state residents.

RESPONSE: IDG objects to this request on the ground that it is overly broad and directed to general jurisdiction even though (1) the Court's Order (ECF No. 60 at 4) specifically states that "Plaintiffs are only relying on specific jurisdiction"; (2) Plaintiffs' counsel expressly disclaimed general jurisdiction at the hearing on IDG's Motion to Dismiss; and (3) Plaintiffs do not allege general jurisdiction in their Complaint. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing, and subject to and without waiving IDG's general objections, IDG states that it is aware of no such documents.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 8: For each Request for Admission that you do not admit, produce all Documents related to or explaining your reasons for not admitting each such Request for Admission.

RESPONSE: IDG objects to this request on the ground that it is overly broad.

OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO SPECIFIC INTERROGATORIES

INTERROGATORY NO. 1: Describe IDG's corporate structure, including all entities for which IDG holds or controls more than 10% of an entity's stock.

RESPONSE: IDG objects to the portion of this Interrogatory that asks IDG to describe its "corporate structure" as it is vague and overly broad. IDG also objects on the

DEFENDANT IDG'S OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO PLAINTIFFS' FIRST SET OF INTERROGATORIES AND REQUESTS FOR ADMISSION PAGE 6

Winston & Cashatt

A PROFESSIONAL SERVICE CORPORATION
1900 Bank of America Financial Center
601 West Riverside
Spokane, Washington 99201
(509) 838-8131

ground that this Interrogatory calls for confidential and commercially-sensitive information. Should the parties enter into an agreement regarding treatment of confidential information, Defendant will supplement with appropriately-designated information regarding IDG's ownership structure.

INTERROGATORY NO. 2: Identify each "brand" or "property" that IDG owns or operates as those terms are used on the following website: https://www.idg.com/properties/.

RESPONSE: Subject to IDG's general objections, IDG states that it does not own CSO or any other brand/property identified on https://www.idg.com/properties/. IDG owns the trademark to each of the properties but it does not own or operate the businesses associated with those trademarks. For example, www.csoonline.com – the website hosting one of the two articles at issue in this suit – is owned and operated by CXO Media, Inc., not IDG. Further, IDG does not own or control CXO Media, Inc.

INTERROGATORY NO. 3: For each "brand" or "property" identified in response to Interrogatory No. 2, provide the following information:

- (a) The amount of revenue the brand or property generates through the sale of its products or services in the United States.
- (b) The amount of revenue the brand or property generates through advertising, whether print- or internet-based in the United States.
- (c) The amount of revenue the brand or property generates through the sale of its products or services to residents of the state of Washington.
- (d) The amount of revenue the brand or property generates through advertising, whether print- or internet-based from views or subscriptions to residents of the state of Washington.

DEFENDANT IDG'S OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO PLAINTIFFS' FIRST SET OF INTERROGATORIES AND REQUESTS FOR ADMISSION PAGE 7



- (e) If the brand or property is an online website, the number of views or daily unique visitors with IP addresses geolocated within the state of Washington.
- (f) If the brand or property is a print product, the number of paid subscriptions sent to an address in the state of Washington.

RESPONSE: IDG objects to this request on the ground that it is overly broad and directed to general jurisdiction even though (1) the Court's Order (ECF No. 60 at 4) specifically states that "Plaintiffs are only relying on specific jurisdiction"; (2) Plaintiffs' counsel expressly disclaimed general jurisdiction at the hearing on IDG's Motion to Dismiss; and (3) Plaintiffs do not allege general jurisdiction in their Complaint. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing, and subject to and without waiving IDG's general objections, IDG states that, as noted in response to Interrogatory No. 2, IDG does not own the properties/brands identified at https://www.idg.com/properties/. Instead, IDG only owns the trademarks but does not own or operate the businesses associated with the trademarks. For example, www.csoonline.com — the website hosting one of the two articles at issue in this suit — is owned and operated by CXO Media, Inc., not IDG. Further, IDG does not own CXO Media, Inc. Consequently, the answer is none for subparts (a)-(f).

INTERROGATORY NO. 4: Describe IDG's relationship to CXO Media, Inc.

RESPONSE: IDG objects to this interrogatory on the ground that it is overly broad and vague as to "relationship." Subject to and without waiving the foregoing, and subject to and without waiving IDG's general objections, IDG states that it does not own CXO Media, Inc. ("CXO"). CXO is owned by IDG Communications, Inc. IDG owns IDG Communications, Inc. but does not own CXO. IDG does not control the day-to-day activities of CXO but does provide, in exchange for a fee, accounting, legal, payroll, IT,

DEFENDANT IDG'S OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO PLAINTIFFS' FIRST SET OF INTERROGATORIES AND REQUESTS FOR ADMISSION PAGE 8

Winston & Cashatt

A PROFESSIONAL SERVICE CORPORATION
1900 Bank of America Financial Center
601 West Riverside
Spokane, Washington 99201
(509) 898-8131

and credit/collection services. However, final decisions with respect to each of those matters are made by CXO for CXO.

INTERROGATORY NO. 5: Identify IDG's executive leadership team (meaning all managers, C-suite executives, and/or corporate officers).

RESPONSE: Subject to and without waiving its general objections, pursuant to Rule 33(d) IDG elects, in lieu of providing a narrative answer, to produce a chart from which its board-elected officers can be derived. In addition to those individuals, Donna Marr is Chief Accounting Officer for IDG, Amy Hanania is Corporate Credit Manager for IDG, and Bushra Khalid is Systems Development Manager for IDG.

INTERROGATORY NO. 6: For each executive identified in response to Interrogatory No. 5, provide the following:

- (a) Does the executive serve as a member of any other company's executive leadership team? If so, identify that company or companies.
- (b) Does the executive serve as a member of any other entity within the IDG family? For purposes of this Interrogatory, the "IDG family" means any company identified as a "property" or "brand" of IDG on the following website: https://www.idg.com/properties/.

RESPONSE: IDG objects to this Interrogatory on the ground that it is overly broad and is also vague as to "executive leadership team". IDG also objects to this Interrogatory on the ground that it is overly broad in seeking information about companies that have nothing to do with this lawsuit. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing, and subject to and without waiving IDG's general objections, IDG states that it does not manage or control the day-to-day operations

DEFENDANT IDG'S OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO PLAINTIFFS' FIRST SET OF INTERROGATORIES AND REQUESTS FOR ADMISSION PAGE 9

23

of CXO Media, Inc. The president of CXO Media, Inc. runs CXO Media, Inc.'s business. Further, pursuant to Rule 33(d) IDG elects, in lieu of providing a narrative answer regarding officers among various companies, to produce a spreadsheet from which board-elected officers and directors can be derived.

INTERROGATORY NO. 9 [SIC]: Describe how IDG earns revenue.

RESPONSE: IDG objects to this Interrogatory on the ground that it is overly broad and not limited in time. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing, and subject to and without waiving IDG's general objections, IDG states that over the last year it has earned income from the following: interest income from cash on hand at banks or brokerage accounts; capital gains; and dividends from subsidiaries (none of which are co-Defendants in this lawsuit).

Respectfully November 28, 2017.

s/Kevin J. Curtis, WSBA No. 12085 WINSTON & CASHATT, LAWYERS 601 W. Riverside, Ste. 1900 Spokane, WA 99201 (509) 838-6131 Facsimile: (509) 838-1416

E-mail Address: kic@winstoncashatt.com

DEFENDANT IDG'S OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO PLAINTIFFS' FIRST SET OF INTERROGATORIES AND REQUESTS FOR ADMISSION PAGE 10



23

Charles L. Babcock IV (admitted pro hac vice) cbabcock@jw.com
Texas Bar No. 01479500
William J. Stowe (admitted pro hac vice) wstowe@jw.com
Texas Bar No. 24075124
JACKSON WALKER L.L.P.
1401 McKinney Street
Suite 1900
Houston, Texas 77010
(713) 752-4360 (telephone)
(713) 308-4116 (facsimile)

Attorneys for Defendants International Data Group, Inc., CXO Media, Inc. and Steve Ragan

DEFENDANT IDG'S OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO PLAINTIFFS' FIRST SET OF INTERROGATORIES AND REQUESTS FOR ADMISSION PAGE 11



CERTIFICATE OF	SERVIC	H
----------------	--------	---

The undersigned hereby certifies under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Washington that on the 28th day of November, 2017, at Spokane, Washington, the foregoing was caused to be served on the following person(s) in the manner indicated:

5	Jason E. Bernstein Newman Du Wors LLP	VIA REGULAR MAIL VIA CERTIFIED MAIL	
6	2101 Fourth Avenue, Suite 1500	HAND DELIVERED	
7	Seattle, WA 98121	BY FACSIMILE	
8	jake@newmanlaw.com	VIA EMAIL	
1	Leeor Neta		
9	Newman Du Wors LLP		
10	600 California St., 11th Floor		
11	San Francisco, CA 94109		
12			
	Attorneys for Plaintiffs		
13	Christopher B. Durbin	VIA REGULAR MAIL	
14	1700 Seventh Avenue, Suite 1900	VIA CERTIFIED MAIL	
15	Seattle, WA 98101-1355	HAND DELIVERED	
16	cdurbin@cooley.com	BY FACSIMILE VIA EMAIL	
17	Matthew D. Brown	A I'V DIMIT	
	Amy M. Smith		
18	Cooley LLP 101 California Street, 5th Floor		
19	San Francisco, CA 94111-5800		
20	brownmd@cooley.com		
21	amsmith@cooley.com		
	Attorneys for Defendant Kromtech		
22	Alliance Corporation		
23			97440
24	DEFENDANT IDG'S OBJECTIONS AND DESPONSES		

DEFENDANT IDG'S OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO PLAINTIFFS' FIRST SET OF INTERROGATORIES AND REQUESTS FOR **ADMISSION** PAGE 12

Winston & Eashatt A PROFESSIONAL SERVICE CORPORATION 1900 Bank of America Financial Center 601 West Riverside Spokane, Washington 99201 (509) 838-6131

1

2

3

4

1	Aaron Rocke	VIA REGULAR MAIL
2	Rocke Law Group, PLLC	VIA CERTIFIED MAIL
3	101 Yesler Way, Suite 603 Seattle, WA 98104	HAND DELIVERED BY FACSIMILE
	aaron@rockelaw.com	VIA EMAIL
5	Attorney for Defendant Chris Vickery	Y
6		
7		Martindale
8	Jane	Martindale
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24	SPECIAL AND IDOIS OF POTICALS AND RESPONSED	

DEFENDANT IDG'S OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO PLAINTIFFS' FIRST SET OF INTERROGATORIES AND REQUESTS FOR ADMISSION PAGE 13

QUinston & Bashatt

A PROFESSIONAL SERVICE CORPORATION
1900 Bank of America Financial Center
601 West Riverside
Spokene, Westington 99201
(509) 838-6131